APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,429	03/28/2001	John M. Mela	21113-05687	5043

22830	7590	01/14/2004

CARR & FERRELL LLP
2200 GENG ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER
THEIN, MARIA TERESA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3625	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 October 2003*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.
    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's "Amendment B" deposited on October 17, 2003 has been considered.

Claim 25 is amended. New claims 26-29 have been added. Claims 1-29 are

pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on October 17, 2003 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

Please note, Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the

references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are

applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures

may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the

applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the

claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or

disclosed by the examiner.

Applicant remarks that the "Examiner specifically point out how Geller et al.

teaches detect(ing) and eliminat(ing) incompatibilities in a result when those

incompatibilities are caused solely by bounceback behavior". Furthermore, Applicant

remarks that "Examiner specifically point out a teaching of Geller et al. that specifically

anticipates modification of a result based on a bounceback behavior".

The Examiner directs Applicant's attention to col. 10, lines 61-63, where Geller discloses rules are needed to define valid and invalid configurations and parameters and constraints are utilized to defined rules for the configuration. The parameter corresponds to a data object available or filed. It is used to contain save, calculate, compare, and display information (col. 10, lines 64-66). The constraints establish the rules that define the valid relationships between parameters (col. 11, lines 3-4). Constraints govern the retrieval, calculation, and display of information in a configuration form (col. 23, lines 46-48). Furthermore, a constraint will evaluate to true or false, valid or invalid, for a given data condition (col. 23, lines 53-54). Specifically, the constraint is applied, or turned on or off, by use of a formula in the "UsedWhen" property of the constraint (col. 26, lines 16-18). The "UsedWhen" property includes a formula (col. 28, lines 39-40), which is displayed in a formula builder window. The formula builder window allows the navigation amongst various parameters and queries, select logical functions, and build a logic formula that evaluates to a true or false condition to control the application of the particular constraint (col. 28, lines 56-64 and col. 26, lines 16-36). An example is taught in Geller, where a set of constraints is used to configure a particular automobile product line. If a user selects a product line of automobiles called Gluon and further selects the Sound tab which features two selectable option "Standard" and "Electronic AM/FM Stereo/Cassette" to indicate that these options are available for selection (col. 24, lines 48-67). However, if a user selects the Meson product line and selects the Sound tab that now features two selectable options "Standard" and "CD changer (6 Discs)" to indicate that these options

are available for selection. The "Electronic AM/FM Stereo/Cassette" is not available for

this product line (col. 25, lines 24-33).

Therefore, such parameters and constraints which are utilized to define the rules

for the configuration, wherein the parameters contain the save, calculate, compare and

the constraints govern the retrieval and calculation and the "UsedWhen" property are

considered the modifying of the results by detecting and eliminating incompatibles

caused solely by bounceback behavior. Applicant's recitation in claim 1 "read on" this

disclosure.

These claims were given the broadest reasonable interpretation in an effort to

reduce the possibility that these claims, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly

than is justified. See In re Prater, 415 F2.d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551

(CCPA 1969).

Applicant remarks that in Claim 2 "Geller et al. does not teach identification of

domain members as being incompatible due to bounceback behavior, Geller et al.

cannot anticipate generating a configuration page on which incompatible domain

members are not marked based on this criteria".

Examiner notes that Geller does teach the identification of domain members as

being incompatible due to bounceback behavior. In col. 25, line 64 – col. 26, line 5,

Geller discloses particular options are particular to a selected product line, and are the

result of a query to a database which fills in the options information based on the

particular product line. The options and particular product line is dependent upon

parameters, queries, and user input. Furthermore, the options are defined by

constraints (col. 26, lines 11-15). The constraint is applied, or turned on or off, by use of a formula in the "UsedWhen" property of the constraint (col. 26, lines 16-18). The "UsedWhen" property includes a formula (col. 28, lines 39-40), which is displayed in a formula builder window. The formula builder window allows the navigation amongst various parameters and queries, select logical functions, and build a logic formula that evaluates to a true or false condition to control the application of the particular constraint (col. 28, lines 56-64 and col. 26, lines 16-36). Such constraint which is applied to the options is considered identification of domain members as being incompatible due to bounceback behavior.

Applicant remarks that "Geller cannot teach any of the several limitations of Claim 5 associated with bounceback". Specifically, Geller does not teach the bounceback detection module adapted to modify the result by detecting and eliminating incompatibilities caused solely by bounceback behavior.

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to the Examiner's response to Applicant's previous remarks regarding Claim 1.

Applicant remarks that "Geller et al. does not teach the modified result of Claim 5, Geller et al. cannot anticipate use of the modified result for generating a configuration page, as recited in Claim 6". Furthermore, Applicant remarks that "Geller does not teach identification of domain members as being incompatible due to bounceback behavior".

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to the Examiner's response to Applicant's previous remarks regarding Claim 1 and Claim 2.

Applicant remarks that Geller does not disclose a method for detecting

bounceback behavior associated with a configuration problem, as recited in Claim 9.

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to the Examiner's response to Applicant's

previous remarks regarding Claim 1.

Applicant remarks that Geller does not teach "setting a bounceback detection bit

vector associated with each non-selected domain member so that each of the

bounceback detection bit vectors indicates bounceback behavior; setting an elimination

flag associated with each non-selected domain member of the particular variable so that

each of those elimination flags indicates that its associated domain member is

tentatively eliminated; and setting a bounceback detection bit vector of an eliminated

domain member to indicate which variable caused its elimination, as recited in Claim 9".

Examiner notes that Geller discloses the recitation above. Geller discloses the

rules define valid and invalid configurations and parameters and constraints are utilized

to defined rules for the configuration (col. 10, lines 61-63). The parameter corresponds

to a data object available or filed. It is used to contain save, calculate, compare, and

display information (col. 10, lines 64-66). The constraints establish the rules that define

the valid relationships between parameters (col. 11, lines 3-4). Constraints govern the

retrieval, calculation, and display of information in a configuration form (col. 23, lines 46-

48). Furthermore, a constraint will evaluate to true or false, valid or invalid, for a given

data condition (col. 23, lines 53-54). Specifically, the constraint is applied, or turned on

or off, by use of a formula in the "UsedWhen" property of the constraint (col. 26, lines

16-18). The "UsedWhen" property includes a formula (col. 28, lines 39-40), which is

displayed in a formula builder window. The formula builder window allows the

navigation amongst various parameters and queries, select logical functions, and build

a logic formula that evaluates to a true or false condition to control the application of the

particular constraint (col. 28, lines 56-64 and col. 26, lines 16-36). In Figures 16A and

16B and col. 26, line 59-col. 27, line 12, Geller discloses a plurality of parameters which

are shown in association with the Sound parameter group, that includes SoundSystem,

SpecialSoundOptionsAvailable, CD and AMPWattage. Certain of these parameters

include an associated group of constraints. The SoundSystem parameter has

associated therewith a plurality of constraints, show as Q SSList (a query constraint), X

Standard (a discrete constraint), And SpecialOptionLists (a string list constraint). The

constraint associated wit the AmpWattage parameter has associated therewith the

constraints WattageRange (a range constraint) and NAWhenStandard (a discrete

constraint). As an example is when the SpecialOptionLists string type constraint is

selected. The properties of the selected constraint include a Name at of

SpecialOptionList, an object type of TbtStringConstratint, a UsedWhen property, and a

String property. The UsedWhen property includes a formula. (col. 28, lines 32-41) In

Figure 19, the formula builder window is displayed when the UsedWhen property is

activated (col. 28, lines 56-58). The formula builder comprises a variables window, a

functions window, and a formula window. (col. 28, lines 65-67). A label is displayed at

the top of the window to indicate the particular path being evaluated which in this case

is: Parameters.Interior.SoundSystem.Constraints.SpeicaloptionsListList.UsedWhen.

The variable window provides a hierarchical display of the parameters and queries. The

function window displays a collection of logical functions which can be applied to define

predetermined conditions for application of the associated constraint, for example

Lookup, Display, DisplayWhen, UsedWhen, and UsedExceptWhen. The formula is:

UsedWhen (Parameters.Interior.Sound.SpecialSoundOptions Available=True). This

expression resolves to the Boolean state (true or false) of the parameter appearing in

formula. If the application of data and user input causes the parameter

SpecialSoundOptionsAvailable to be true, the UsedWhen formula evaluates as true, the

string list indicated by the SpecialOptionLists is applied, thereby causing the display of

the data values shown. (col. 28, line 65 –col. 29, line 32)

Such parameters associated with a group of constraints and wherein the

properties of the selected constraint include a Name at of SpecialOptionList, an object

type of TbtStringConstratint, a UsedWhen property, and a String property are

considered setting a bounceback detection bit vector associated with each non-selected

domain member so that each of the bounceback detection bit vectors indicates

bounceback behavior; an elimination flag associated with each non-selected domain

member of the particular variable so that each of those elimination flags indicates that

its associated domain member is tentatively eliminated; and a bounceback detection bit

vector of an eliminated domain member to indicate which variable caused its

elimination, as recited in Claim 9.

Applicant remarks that Geller cannot teach initializing the elimination flag, as

recited in Claim 10.

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to the discussion above pertaining to Claim 9.

Applicant remarks that "Applicant is not able to find teachings that indicates that the particular variable associated with the selected domain member is responsible for elimination of the non-selected domain members", as recited in Claim 12. Furthermore, Applicant remarks that "Applicant is not able to find teachings of not indicating bounceback behavior as a result of subsequent constraint propagation", and "a bounceback detection bid vector associated with that non-selected domain member", as recited in Claim 13.

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to the discussion above pertaining to Claim 1 and Claim 9.

Applicant remarks that "Applicant is not able to find teachings of overriding the tentative elimination of a non-selected domain member in response to the bounceback detection bit vector", as recited in Claim 14. Furthermore, Applicant remarks that "Applicant is not able to find the copying the bounceback detection bit vector associated with the eliminated domain member", as recited in Claim 15.

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to col. 26, lines 39-40) Geller teaches the constraint is applied, or turned on or off, by use of a formula in the "UsedWhen" property of the constraint (col. 26, lines 16-18). The "UsedWhen" property includes a formula (col. 28, lines 39-40), which is displayed in a formula builder window. The formula builder window allows the navigation amongst various parameters and queries, select logical functions, and build a logic formula that evaluates to a true or false condition to

control the application of the particular constraint (col. 28, lines 56-64 and col. 26, lines

16-36). In Figures 16A and 16B and col. 26, line 59-col. 27, line 12, Geller discloses a

plurality of parameters which are shown in association with the Sound parameter group,

that includes SoundSystem, SpecialSoundOptionsAvailable, CD and AMPWattage.

Certain of these parameters include an associated group of constraints. The

SoundSystem parameter has associated therewith a plurality of constraints, show as Q

SSList (a query constraint), X Standard (a discrete constraint), And SpecialOptionLists

(a string list constraint). The constraint associated wit the AmpWattage parameter has

associated therewith the constraints WattageRange (a range constraint) and

NAWhenStandard (a discrete constraint). As an example, the SpecialOptionLists string

type constraint is selected. The properties of the selected constraint include a Name at

of SpecialOptionList, an object type of TbtStringConstratint, a UsedWhen property, and

a String property. The UsedWhen property includes a formula. (col. 28, lines 32-41) In

Figure 19, the formula builder window is displayed when the UsedWhen property is

activated (col. 28, lines 56-58). The formula builder comprises a variables window, a

functions window, and a formula window. (col. 28, lines 65-67). A label is displayed at

the top of the window to indicate the particular path being evaluated which in this case

is: Parameters.Interior.SoundSystem.Constraints.SpeicaloptionsListList.UsedWhen.

The variable window provides a hierarchical display of the parameters and queries. The

function window displays a collection of logical functions which can be applied to define

predetermined conditions for application of the associated constraint, for example

Lookup, Display, DisplayWhen, UsedWhen, and UsedExceptWhen. The formula is:

UsedWhen (Parameters.Interior.Sound.SpecialSoundOptions Available=True). This expression resolves to the Boolean state (true or false) of the parameter appearing in formula. If the application of data and user input causes the parameter SpecialSoundOptionsAvailable to be true, the UsedWhen formula evaluates as true, the string list indicated by the SpecialOptionLists is applied, thereby causing the display of the data values shown. (col. 28, line 65 –col. 29, line 32)

Such combination of the parameters associated with a group of constraints, formula builder which includes a variables window, a functions window, and a formula window and "UsedWhen" property are considered the overriding the tentative elimination of a non-selected domain member in response to the bounceback detection bit vector and the copying the bounceback detection bit vector associated with the identified domain member to the bounceback detection bit vector associated with the eliminated domain member.

Applicant remarks that "Applicant is not able to find teachings of identifying a join corresponding to a disjunction; logically ANDing the bounceback detection bit vector; and copying the resulting bounceback detection bit vector to the bounceback detection bit vector associated with the eliminated domain member", as recited in Claim 16 and Claim 23 . Furthermore, Applicant remarks that "Applicant is not able to find teachings of identifying a join corresponding to a disjunction; logically ORing the bounceback detection bit vector; and copying the resulting bounceback detection bit vector to the bounceback detection bit vector associated with the eliminated domain member", as recited in Claim 17 and Claim 24.

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to col. 30, lines 38-49, Geller discloses a formula builder window, which is utilized to define a formula for application of a constraint to a parameter. The formula builder window includes a Variable window, a Function window, and a Formula window, as discussed above. In addition a ValidWhen function is utilized. Furthermore in col. 31, lines 20-29, Geller discloses the formula constraint is useful for assigning an invalid value to a constrained parameter. Use of the various functions such as Lookup, Display, DisplayWhen, ValidWhen, and ValidExceptWhen, allow a logical condition associated with a parameter to be calculated. Such formula builder which includes a Variable window, a Function window, and a Formula window is considered identifying a join corresponding to a disjunction; logically ORing the bounceback detection bit vector; logically ANDing the bounceback detection bit vector; and copying the resulting bounceback detection bit vector to the bounceback detection bit vector associated with the eliminated domain member.

Applicant remarks that "Applicant is not able to find teaching of domain members identified as being eliminated due to bounceback behavior are not marked", as recited in Claim 18.

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to the discussion above pertaining to Claim 1 and Claim 2.

Applicant remarks that "Applicant is not able to find teaching of identifying a domain member causing the eliminated domain member to be eliminated" or copying the bounceback detection bit vector associated". as recited in Claim 22.

Examiner directs Applicant's attention to the discussion above pertaining to

Claim 2 and Claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 5,844,554 to Geller et al. Regarding claims 1-8, Geller discloses a method

and system for performing a product configuration, (col. 3, lines 24-40; col. 10, lines 44-

53) the method comprising: receiving user input specifying at least one selected

domain member (col. 3, lines 24-40; col. 16, lines 1-15; col. 10, lines 44-53);

propagating the constraints over the received user input thereby producing a result the

identifies incompatibilities between the domain member caused the at least one select

domain member (col. 11, lines 3-27; col. 23, line 46 – col. 24, line 47; col. 24, lines 59-

col. 25, line 52; col. 26, lines 16-44); modifying the result by detecting and eliminating

incompatibilities caused solely by bounceback behavior (col. 10, lines 64- col. 11, line

27; col. 12, lines 51-56; col. 18, line 26 – col. 19, line 9; col. 23, line 46 – col. 24, line 47;

col. 24, lines 59-col. 25, line 52; col. 25, line 64 – col. 26, line 44; col. 28, line 56 – col.

29, line 32). Furthermore, Geller disclose generating a configuration page based on the

modified result so thát domain members identified as being incompatible due to

bounceback behavior are not marked as conflicted choices on the configuration page

(col. 25, lines 1-45; Figures 14A-14B, 15A-15B); providing the configuration of the user

(col. 25, lines 1-45; Figures 14A-14B, 15A-15B); repeating steps included in the method

until the product configuration is complete (col. 10, lines 7-28); and the method is

implemented by a set of software instructions running on a computer (col. 1, lines 6-9;

col. 10, lines 13-17; col. 12, lines 51-56).

Regarding to claims 9-10 and 21, Geller discloses a method for detecting

bounceback behavior associated with a configuration problem (col. 11, lines 3-27; col.

23, line 46 – col. 24, line 47), the method comprising: receiving a domain member

selection for a particular variable (col. 3, lines 24-40; col. 16, lines 1-15; col. 10, lines

44-53); setting a bounceback detection bit vector (Examiner has interpreted bit vector

as parameter) (col. 10, line 64 - col. 11, line 2; col. 29, lines 34-col. 30, line 4)

associated with each non-selected domain member of the particular variable so that

each of those bounceback detection bit vectors indicates bounceback behavior (col. 13,

lines 52-61; col. 18, lines 7-8); setting an elimination flag associated with each non-

selected domain member of the particular variable (col. 11, lines 3-11; col. 13, lines 52-

61; col. 18, lines 7-8); propagating the constraints to identify eliminated domain

members of the variables; setting the bounceback detection bit vector of the eliminated

domain members to indicate which variable caused their elimination; setting the

elimination flag of each of the other eliminated domain members; initializing the

bounceback detection bit vector for each domain member of each variable; and

initializing the elimination flag for each domain member of each variable. (Col. 10, lines

64- col. 11, line 27; col. 12, lines 51-56; col. 18, line 26 – col. 19, line 9; col. 23, line 46 –

col. 24, line 47; col. 24, lines 59-col. 25, line 52; col. 25, line 64 – col. 26, line 44; col.

28, line 56 – col. 30, line 4; col. 30, line 5- col. 31, line 29).

Regarding claims 11-14, Geller discloses the receiving step includes receiving a

plurality of domain member selection associated with a corresponding number of

particular variables, and the setting and propagation steps of the method are performed

for each domain member selections (col. 3, lines 24-40; col. 10, line 64 - col. 11, line 2;

col. 16, lines 1-15; col. 10, lines 44-53); the bounceback detections bit vectors that

indicate bounceback behavior indicate the particular variable associated with the

selected domain member is responsible for elimination of the non-selected domain

members; confirming the tentative elimination of a non-selected domain member in

response to the bounceback detection bit vector associated with the non-selected

domain member not indicating bounceback behavior as a result of subsequent

constraint propagation; overriding the tentative elimination of a non-selected domain

member in response to the bounceback detection bit vector associated with that non-

selected domain member indicating bounceback behavior despite subsequent

constraint propagation. (Col. 10, lines 64- col. 11, line 27; col. 12, lines 51-56; col. 18,

line 26 – col. 19, line 9; col. 23, line 46 – col. 24, line 47; col. 24, lines 59-col. 25, line

52; col. 25, line 64 – col. 26, line 44; col. 28, line 56 – col. 30, line 4p; col. 30, line 5- col.

31, line 29).

Regarding claims 15-17 and 22-24, Geller discloses the step of setting the

bounceback detection bit vector of an eliminated domain member to indicate which

variable caused that domain member's elimination includes: based on the constraints,

identifying a domain member causing the eliminated domain member to be eliminated;

copying the bounceback detection bit vector associated with the identified domain

member to the bounceback detection bit vector associated with the eliminated domain

member; wherein the step of setting the bounceback detection bit vector of an

eliminated domain member to indicate which variable caused that domain member's

elimination includes: based on constraints, identifying a join corresponding to a

disjunction or conjunction; logically ANDing or ORing the bounceback detection bit

vectors associated with the domain members included in the join thereby producing a

resulting bounceback detection bit vector; and copying the resulting bounceback

detection bit vector to the bounceback detection bit vector associated wit the eliminated

domain member. (Col. 23, line 46 – col. 24, line 47; col. 24, lines 59-col. 25, line 52; col.

25, line 64 – col. 26, line 44; col. 28, line 56 – col. 30, line 4; col. 30, line 5- col. 31, line

29)

       Regarding claim 18-20, and 25, Geller generating a configuration page based on

the modified result so that domain members identified as being eliminated due to

bounceback behavior are not marked as conflicted choices on the configuration page

(col. 25, lines 1-45; Figures 14A-14B, 15A-15B); providing the configuration of the user

(col. 25, lines 1-45; Figures 14A-14B, 15A-15B); wherein steps of the method are

repeated each time a user submits one or more domain member selections (col. 10,

lines 7-28); and the method is implemented by a set of software instructions running on

a computer (col. 1, lines 6-9; col. 10, lines 13-17; col. 12, lines 51-56).

Regarding claims 26 and 29, Geller discloses a method and a computer readable medium comprising:

- receiving user input specifying at least a first domain member of a plurality of domain members, the plurality of domain members being associated with a variable of the product configuration (see at least col. 7, lines 54-61; col. 8, lines 57-67);

- propagating one or more constraints associated with the received user input to product a result that identifies a potential incompatibility of a second domain member of the plurality of domain members, the one or more constraints characterizing limits on the product configuration (see at least col. 25, lines 14-25; col. 26, lines 11-36; col. 28, lines 32-41; col. 28, line 56 – col. 29, line 31); and

- modifying the result by eliminating the potential incompatibility if the potential incompatibility is caused solely by the specification of the first domain member and constraint propagation resulting from the specification of the first domain member (see at least col. 25, lines 14-45; col. 26, lines 10-36; col. 28, lines 32-41; col. 28, line 56 – col. 29, line 32).

Regarding claim 27, Geller discloses the constraint propagation involves at least one other variable of the product configuration (see at least col. col. 28, lines 31-41; col. 28, line 56 – col. 29, line 32).

Regarding claim 28, Geller discloses a system comprising:

- means for receiving user input specifying at least a first domain member of a plurality of domain members, the plurality of domain members being associated wit a first variable of the product configuration (see at least col. 7, lines 54-61; col. 8, lines 57-67);

- means for identifying an incompability in the product configuration, the incompatibility being based on the user input and propagation of constraints of the product configuration, the identification excluding any incompatibilities caused solely by bounceback behavior (see at least col. 25, lines 14-25; col. 26, lines 11-36; col. 28, lines 32-41; col. 28, line 56 – col. 29, line 31); and

- producing a result including the identified incompatibility (see at least col. 25, lines 14-45; col. 26, lines 10-36; col. 28, lines 32-41; col. 28, line 56 – col. 29, line 32).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marissa Thein whose telephone number is 703-305-5246. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Smith can be reached on 703-308-3588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

1113.

mtot
January 12, 2004

Jeffrey A. Smith
Primary Examiner